Gryshchenko O. V.,
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor of the English Philology and
Translation Department, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University

LIE, DECEPTION, FAKE AND TRUTH

Summary. The article deals with the notions of "lie", "deception", "fake" and "truth". Linguistic markers of lying are systemized. Characteristics and peculiarities of fake are defined. Fake is a form of deceptive communication which is oriented to manipulation and spread through mass media.

Key words: lie, deception, fake, truth, fake discourse, multiplicity.

> People may be liars but words are not.
> D. Bolinger

Introduction. The notions of "truth" and "lying" have been in the focus of philosophers and other researchers for many centuries. Aristotle's concept of truth encompasses philosophy, language, ethics and psychology. Plato represented the concept of "true lie" or "lie in the soul" in his famous work "Republic".

Linguists emphasized the importance of studying the questions of "truth" and "lying" in terms of linguistics long time ago. H. Weinrich (in "The Linguistics of Lying", 1965) believed that lying was "of concern to linguistics" as linguistics could "describe what happens in language when truth is distorted into lie" [14, c. 9]. Later in 1973 Dwight Bolinger stated (in his work with the same name – "Truth is a Linguistic Question") that "Truth is a linguistic question because communication is impossible without it". He thought that the notion of truth was relevant to linguistics and linguists "already accept some responsibility for language", as "the possibilities of deception have passed the bounds of tolerance" and insisted that "the act of coining a new expression is conscious, and any lying is deliberate" [5, c. 549, 541–542, 545]. T. A van Dijk views lying as "a complex phenomenon that may be dealt with in philosophical (ethical), semantic, pragmatic, psychological, social, political, and cultural terms; and defines it as "the illegitimate manipulation of knowledge" [7].

Theoretical Background. The study of linguistic differences (strategic and non-strategic linguistic cues) between the language use of liars, deceivers and truth-tellers revealed the fact that liars generally use more words than other speakers, which is known as Pinocchio Effect. Lying is distinguished from deception by omission and deception by commission (Swol et al., 2012). Liars and truth-tellers have different linguistic styles; linguistic markers which are manifested in deceptive and truthful communication prove that liars and truth-tellers communicate differently (Newman et al., 2003). Deception is an interactive process which is characterized in terms of linguistic cues, it influences linguistic profiles of liars and partners and modifies the whole communication process (Hancock et al., 2010). Lying includes a higher cognitive load and liars' speech manifests markers of deception which are hard to control, among them "um" and "like" utterances. It was found out that "um" is a marker of truth and "like" is a marker of deception (Arciuli et al., 2010). Linguistic features of deception are identified with the help of computational systems which make it possible to compare natural language processing technologies (Duran et al., 2009). The discourse of truth and the discourse of invention (deception) have different linguistic characteristics which are revealed due to uncontrollable psychological processes of speakers (Dilmon, 2008).

Fake includes issues of copy, forgery, simulacrum, pseudo, counterfeit etc., which represents the conflict between fiction and reality, illusion and real world, appearance and reality, reality and hyperreality (Mecacci, 2016). It is studied in terms of fake news and politics (Higgs, 2017), fake social information (Wessel et al., 2016) and fake identity in literature and culture (Rosenthal et al., 2014) and in social media (Krombholz et al., 2012).

The main **purpose** of this paper is to characterize features and linguistic markers of fake. The tasks are the following: to compare the notions of "lie", "deception" and "fake"; to describe the peculiarities of fake manifested in mass media; to systemize approaches to the study of linguistic markers of lying.

Results and Discussion. Lying, deception and fake are very similar and are always opposed to the truth. They all include 'the act of tricking someone by telling them something that is not true'. The meaning of fake contains much more and has a wider sphere of application and mode of existence – mainly politics, news and mass media discourse. Fake includes forgery, counterfeit, false actions and feelings, not real events and information (fake news), false statements (mendacity).

Fake has become an integral part of life in our modern world and continues to extend its influence and tends to substitute more and more real things. To support this fact, there are numerous new word combinations with 'fake' and neologisms that have recently appeared in the media (earlier other examples were recorded [1, c. 40]):

fake achievement	*fake elections*	*fake policy*
fake artist	*fake ending*	*fake politics*
fake alarm	*fake evidence*	*fake PR*
fake angels	*fake economy*	*fake Physics*
fake army	*fake English*	*fake raid*
fake architecture	*fake error*	*fake rake*
fake assembly	*fake embassy*	*fake reaction*
fake attention	*fake facebook*	*fake research*
fake opinion	*fake festival*	*fake rock*
fake bake	*fake girl*	*fake script*
fake blood	*fake grants*	*fake song*
fake conclusion	*fake holidays*	*fake signups*
fake colours	*fake human*	*fake talks*
fake code	*fake hacker*	*fake town*
fake celebrity	*fake kidnapping*	*fake update*
fake definition	*fake love*	*fake voice*
fake diagnosis	*fake library*	*fake wars*
fake doors	*fake music*	*fake wow*
fake design	*fake number*	*fake water*
fake donation	*fake notes*	*fake zoo*
fake download	*fake news headlines*	

Neologisms and compound words (mainly blends) appear, they are not registered in dictionaries yet but are already represented in online dictionaries and their number is constantly increasing. Here are the examples from the online Urban Dictionary: *fakeality* (an alternative reality); *fakeagenda* (a small notebook you take to a meeting not to be empty-handed); *fakeaway* (a form of take-away food); *fake day* (the day that did not exist); *fakeaphobia* (the state when someone is afraid of fake); *fakeability* (the ability to fake a medical or mental state); *fakeation* (fake vacation, when someone pretends to be away and even does not answer the phone); *fakeawake* (when someone is exhausted and sleepy but has to act awake and energetic); *fakebelieve* (not to believe in something, but to pretend to believe); *fakecare* (when you take care of your roommate's pet, that you don't like); *fakecitement* (not real excitement)*; fakelationship* (a kind of relationship or friendship when you mostly text, email and talk on the telephone, or emphasize that you are "just friends"); *fakerage* ("acres of land on the outskirts of cities"); *fakefess* (when a person who is not guilty has to make a fake confession); *fakebook* (creating a profile which is not true; adding to Facebook people who are not really friends); *fakelebrity* (someone who has a celebrity status but hasn't done anything special); *fakefresh* (not really fresh); *fakenger* ("someone who rides a messenger-style car, carries a messenger bag, but is not actually a messenger"); *faken*ence (not real pregnancy); *fakeness* (overload of faking); *fakenology* ("Hi-tech Concepts, ideas, words, or objects that only exist in science fiction movies or TV shows that usually involve space travel"); *fakenority* (fake + minority, not a real minority); *Fakepenese* (an Asian who looks like a Japanese, but usually Korean or Chinese); *Faketalians* (people who behave like Italians); *Fakexican* (a person who is not Mexican but starts to act as if he is Mexican); *fake O* (someone who is a big poser and acts in a fake way); *fakephoning* (pretending you are on the phone in order to avoid an unpleasant talk or meeting); *fakepression* (false and not true impression); *fakepresident* ("when a President of the United States is elected with less popular votes than his or her opponent", e.g.: *President Trump exhibits all of the characteristics of a fakepresident*); *fakequaintance* (people who contact you only when they need a favour); *fakeration* (when someone states something which is not true); *fakery* (fake bakery; someone who acts fake; the practice or result of faking something); *Fakesgiving* (celebration of Thanksgiving not on the actual day); *fakesmart* (when someone is not very smart but pretends to be and studies hard); *fakespeak* ("a manner of speaking in non-real terms"); *fakespect* (not real respect, disrespect); *fake-stupid* (someone who is not intelligent but acts smart, or vice versa, someone who is smart but behaves in a silly way); *fake take* (when someone pretends that they have taken someone's telephone number, but they really haven't); *fake talk* (not real talk, nonsense); *faketarian* (someone who is not a real vegetarian); *faketastic* ('fake' and 'fantastic' at the same time, usually about food); *fakethusiasm* (not real enthusiasm); *faketitious* (fake + fictitious); *faketivist* (someone who pretends to be an activist); *faketography* (fake photography); *faketriotism* (not real defense, love and support); *faketry* ("the art of being fake, not loyal, not real, not true"); *fakevice* (advice that does more harm); *fakewild* (upset because you need attention); *fake word* (a word which is invented in order to replace the unknown word); *fake-a-friend* (someone who acts as if he is your friend but who doesn't know what friendship is); *fake world problem* ("the kind of situations that are invented to add more drama to real world problems that are on the surface ridiculous when compared to even First World Problems"); *fake yoga* (when someone uses yoga "to define personal style or to make money in the yoga business"); *fake wild* (pretending to be sad and upset, but really to be "in want of attention"); *Fake Birthday* (false date of birth, not real birthday); *fake in-laws* (people who are not your in-laws but you have to communicate regularly); *fake Friday* ("the day before a long holiday in the middle of the week"); *fake work friend* ("someone who talks to you and acts like they're your good friend in the workplace but has nothing to do with you after hours"); *faking caking* ("a relationship that is fake") [13].

The widespread influence of fake is provided with the help of mass media. We can not deny the fact that "whatever we know about our society, or indeed about the world in which we live, we know through the mass media" [10, c. 1]. The reality it exists in and creates has a dual sense and makes it possible to distinguish "a first reality" (self-reference) and "a second reality" (other-reference) [10, c. 4]. It is capable of creating another reality with its truths, beliefs and values. We suppose that our modern media scene with the technology of "multiplicity of truths" [3] suggests the existence of multiple realities. Fake becomes a substitute for "reality", "fakeality".

When we refer to fake we mainly associate it with fake news. Usually the audience believes that the information that is presented in news and reports is true and undeniable. But the hidden aspects of "selection" (selectors – surprise, conflicts, quantities, local relevance, norm violations, particular people, topicality, expression of opinions) [10, c. 27] and control or limitation of "access" to information, knowledge and discourse [8] help to construe the other truth and reality. Improbable becomes probable, discourse of truth turns into fake discourse [2].

The main components of fake are "lie", "deceit" and "manipulation" [2, c. 21]. Linguistic behavior and linguistic markers of lying in discourse of deception and fake discourse are similar. Language use of liars has the following characteristics: more omitted elements and deleted agents, passive forms and impersonal "they", passive adjectives etc [5]. Those who lie use more words as they invent details for a non-existent event (the process is known as Pinocchio Effect), use more content-free function words (pronouns – fewer 1st person and more 3rd person), make fewer self-oriented references to distance from what they are saying, use more negative words and contradictions, use more words with negative emotions and swear words, suffer from a higher cognitive load, have less coherent and cohesive speech with higher ratings of concreteness, use more causation words and numbers [12]. They use filler words ("um", "like") in a specific way. Due to increased cognitive load communication of liars is non-authentic and requires a lot of effort [4]. Lying which is intended to mislead others involves three kinds of linguistic manipulation – concealment and vagueness, persuasion, and distancing of responsibility which results in definite linguistic behavior [6]. Deceivers use a lot of meaningful and concrete words, avoid sentence complexity, ask fewer questions to prevent suspicion [9]. Liars use the lower rate of self-references, fewer "exclusive" words ("but", "except", "without"), more "motion" verbs. The following linguistic categories are features of a linguistic style and the elements of a linguistic profile [11].

Conclusions. Fake is a kind of lying which is oriented to manipulation, represented and spread through mass media. It has a wide sphere of application and mode of existence – from news and political to other discourse types and creolized discourses. Fake news is a specific integrative type of media text, the main components of which (lie, deceit and manipulation) correspond to and define its main function – manipulative function.

Fake is a form of deceptive communication (fake discourse) in which specific linguistic markers and characteristics are manifested. The study of fake, of its aspects and other linguistic cues and markers can give a considerable insight into the nature of linguistic identity and fake linguistic identity.

References:

1. Грищенко О.В. Фейкова мовна особистість із погляду дискурсивної
2. лінгвістики / О.В. Грищенко // Науковий вісник Дрогобицького держ. пед. ун-ту імені Івана Франка. Серія «Філологічні науки» (мовознавство) : зб. наук. пр. – Дрогобич, 2016. – № 6. – С. 39–41.
3. Грищенко О.В. Fake, Fake discourse and Linguistic personality / О.В. Грищенко // Каразінські читання: Людина. Мова. Комунікація : тези доповідей XVI наук. конф. з міжнар. участю. – Харків : ХНУ імені В.Н. Каразіна, 2017. – С. 21–22.
4. Почепцов Г. Сегодняшний мир столкнулся с новой технологией –
5. «множественностью правд» / Г. Почепцов // Хвиля. – 11 сентября 2016. – [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа : http://hvylya.net/analytics/tech/y-mir-stolknulsya-s-novoy-tehnologiey-mnozhestvennostyu-pravd.html.
6. Arciuli J., Mallard D. & Villar G. "Um, I can tell you're lying" : Linguistic markers of deception versus truth-telling in speech / J. Arciuli, D. Mallard & G. Villar // Applied Psycholinguistics 31. – 2010. – P. 397–411.
7. Bolinger D. Truth is a Linguistic Question / D. Bolinger. – Linguistic Society of America // Language. – Vol 49. – No. 3 (Sep., 1973). – P. 539–550.
8. Dilmon R. Between thinking and speaking – Linguistic tools for detecting a fabrication / R. Dilmon // Journal of Pragmatics 41. – 2009. – P. 1152–1170.
9. Dijk van Teun A. Contextualization in Parliamentary Discourse : Aznar, Iraq and the Pragmatics of Lying / T.A. van Dijk // Congreso Discurso Oral, Almeria 24 – 26, November 2005. – [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : http://www.discursos.org/unpublished%20articles/Contextualization%20in%20parliamentary%20discourse.htm.
10. Dijk van Teun A. Discourse, power and access / T. A. van Dijk // Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis. – London : Routledge, 1996. – C. 84–104.
11. Duran N.D., Hall C., McCarthy P.M. & McNamara D.S. The linguistics
12. correlates of conversational deception : Comparing natural language processing technologies / N.D. Duran, C. Hall, P.M. McCarthy & D.S. McNamara // Applied Psycholinguistics 31. – 2010. – P. 430–462.
13. Luhmann N. The reality of the Mass Media / N. Luhmann. – Stanford
14. University Press : Stanford, California, 2000. – 154 p.
15. Newman M.L. & J.W. Pennebaker, Berry D.S., Richards J.M. Lying Words: Predicting Deception From Linguistic Styles / M.L. Newman, J.W. Pennebaker, D.S. Berry, J.M. Richards // Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. – Vol. 29. – № 5. – May 2003. – P. 665–675.
16. Swol L.M., Braun M.T. & Malhotra B. Evidence for the Pinocchio Effect : Linguistic Differences between Lies, deception by Omissions, and Truths / Lyn M Van Swol, Michael T. Braun & Deepak Malhotra // Discourse Processes. – 2012. – P. 79–106.
17. Urban Dictionary [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=on%20line.
18. Weinrich H. The Linguistics of Lying and other essays / H. Weinrich. – University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 2005. – 176 p.

Грищенко О. В. Брехня, обман, фейк і правда

Анотація. Стаття присвячена розгляду понять «брехня», «обман», «фейк» і «правди». Систематизовано лінгвістичні маркери брехні. Визначено характеристики й особливості фейку. Фейк – це вид комунікації, яка зорієнтована на обман і маніпуляцію та поширюється в мас-медіа.

Ключові слова: брехня, обман, фейк, правда, фейк-дискурс, множинність.

Грищенко Е. В. Ложь, обман, фейк и правда

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются понятия «ложь», «обман», «фейк» и «правда». Систематизированы лингвистические маркеры лжи. Определены характеристики и особенности фейка. Фейк – это вид коммуникации, которая ориентирована на обман и манипуляцию и распространяется в масс-медиа.

Ключевые слова: ложь, обман, фейк, правда, фейк-дискурс, множественность.